

Sanitized - Approved For Release SEP 16 1965 CIA-R

STATINTL

# LATIN POLICY IS CRITICIZED BY FULBRIGHT

## Dominican Intervention 'Mistake' Blamed On Bad Advice, Envoy

By JOSEPH R. L. STERN

(Washington Bureau of The Sun)

Washington, Sept. 15—Senator Fulbright (D., Ark.) said today that the United States military intervention in the Dominican Republic last April was a "grievous mistake" caused by officials who exaggerated the danger of a Communist takeover.

Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, carefully exonerated President Johnson, saying that the President was the victim of faulty advice.

But he was highly critical of Ambassador William Tapley Bennett, charging that Bennett failed to seize early opportunities to bring about a cease-fire in the hope that Dominican militarists would crush the left-wing uprising.

### "Deep" Distrust Found

Fulbright warned that the intervention Bennett subsequently arranged had provoked "deep and widespread" distrust of the United States among young social reformers who will control the political future of Latin America.

While most of these reformers are non-Communists whose goals are similar to those of the Alliance for Progress, Fulbright said United States support of the status quo and "reactionary oligarchies" could drive them to communism.

The Senator's hour-long speech drew angry retorts from Senator Long (D., La.) and Senator Smathers (D., Fla.), who contended that the President's prompt action had forestalled Communist efforts to seize the Dominican Republic in the same manner that Fidel Castro seized Cuba.

### White House Summons

Fulbright's criticisms from hindsight were unfair, they suggested, since he had not objected to the impending landing of marines when he was summoned to the White House along with other congressional leaders on the night of April 28.

At the White House this afternoon it was emphasized that President Johnson still has the high regard for Ambassador Bennett that he publicly mentioned during the height of the Dominican crisis.

Bill D. Moyers, presidential press secretary, said he personally had read the Fulbright speech and then talked "to a number of Government officials, career and otherwise, who simply do not believe the Senator's conclusions were justified."

Moyers declined to say whether the President was one of the officials he had consulted and said he did not know if Mr. Johnson was pleased or displeased.

Fulbright's speech was based, in part, on evidence gathered by his committee during a series of closed hearings with Bennett and other officials who hold high positions in United States policy toward Latin America.

So deeply divided was the committee at the conclusion of this investigation that the idea of publishing a report was abandoned.

### Support By Morse

Fulbright's critical view of the Dominican operation and his fear that the United States is alienating the non-Communist Left in Latin America reportedly are shared by some "liberal" members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Among those placed in this category today by a knowledgeable source were Senators Sparkman (D., Ala.), Mansfield (D., Mont.), Clark (D., Pa.), Morse (D., Ore.), Gore (D., Tenn.), Church (D., Idaho), Pell (D., R.I.), McCarthy (D., Minn.) and Aiken (R., Vt.).

Of this group, Senator Clark took the floor to say that he was in "complete accord" with Fulbright's "sound and wise" speech.

Among the Foreign Relations Committee members who are said to be fully behind the President's Dominican policy are Senators Lausche (D., Ohio), Dodd (D., Conn.), Hickenlooper (R., Iowa), Mundt (R., S.D.) and

Dodd said he would reply to Fulbright tomorrow, thus indicating the Senate may have a second day of the kind of give-and-take debate that has been notably absent in the set speeches on Vietnam.

Fulbright launched his attack today by charging that there had been a "lack of candor" about United States actions during the entire Dominican operation.

Officials responsible, he said, were so panicky at the thought of "another Cuba" that they exaggerated both the danger to United States citizens and the extent of Communist influence in the rebel movement.

### OAS Preferral Backed

As a result, the Senator continued, President Johnson was supplied with faulty and unreliable information that left him no choice but to order the intervention.

Fulbright was less gentle, however, in assessing the President's role after the decision to intervene.

He faulted the Administration for failing to place the matter before the Organization of American States before the landing of the Marines.

He noted that the "pretext" of sending in troops to safeguard American citizens had to be replaced by the anti-Communist argument to justify the intervention.

And he said the number of troops sent in was so large that the United States found it difficult to extricate itself from a situation where it had intervened "up to its eyebrows."

Fulbright said he had no doubts about the President's personal belief in the social reform goals of the Alliance for Progress, noting that Mr. Johnson had recently equated the alliance with his own Great Society program.

But the Foreign Relations Committee chairman expressed deep concern over what he characterized as a drift to the right among United States officials who have a policymaking role in Latin America.

In the Dominican Republic itself, Fulbright observed, the United States had moved from a position of supporting the social reformer, Juan Bosch, in the 1963 elections to opposing a "legitimate" revolution to restore him to the office two years later.

### "Uncertainty" Decried

Senator went on, there have been

signs that the United States may be getting into a position of repelling instead of luring the vigorous social reform movements evident throughout Latin America.

Citing a preoccupation with "anti-communism" among some United States diplomats and with "counter-insurgency" in the Pentagon, Fulbright said:

"It is of great importance that the uncertainty as to United States aims in Latin America be resolved.

"We cannot successfully advance the cause of popular democracy and at the same time align ourselves with corrupt and reactionary oligarchies; yet that is what we seem to be trying to do....

### Social Revolution Foreseen

"The movement of the future in Latin America is social revolution. The question is whether it is to be Communist or democratic revolution, and the choice which the Latin American makes will depend in part on how the United States uses its great influence.

"It should be very clear that the choice is not between social revolution and conservative oligarchy but whether, by supporting reform, we bolster the popular non-Communist Left or whether, by supporting unpopular oligarchies, we drive the rising generation of educated and patriotic young Latin Americans to an embittered and hostile form of communism like that of Fidel Castro in Cuba."

Since the intervention is a fact, Fulbright said, the presence of OAS forces should be used to curb the power of Dominican militarists.

### "Bridges" To World Asked

In this way, he contended, the United States might begin the process of winning back the support of young reformers throughout the hemisphere.

The Senator also said the United States should begin loosening its ties with Latin American countries and encouraging them to "build bridges" with nations in Europe, Africa, Asia and even in the Communist bloc.

Sanitized - Approved For Release SEP 16 1965 CIA-RDP75-00149R000200920064-2

Continued

lationship with the United States, he contended, they would become less resentful and suspicious of this country.

The Fulbright statements that caused the greatest immediate controversy concerned Bennett's actions during the crisis and the degree of Communist involvement in the uprising.

The Senator charged that the Ambassador was against Bosch and the left-wing rebel movement.

Hence, he said, Bennett had not seized an opportunity to end the fighting when it appeared the conservative elements would win handily.

#### Exaggeration Charged

When rebel fighting continued, Fulbright added, the Ambassador secured President Johnson's decision to intervene by exaggerating the danger to American citizens and the degree of Communist influence in the rebel movement.

Fulbright insisted that the Communists had no part in the early planning of the reformers' revolution and at no time controlled it.

The irony of the situation, he said, is that the United States foreclosed all opportunity to compete with the Communists within the rebel movement and, instead, engaged in actions that produced "Communist converts" in Latin America.

#### Cuba Takeover Cited

Senators Long and Smathers took up Fulbright on this point by recalling the experience in Cuba where a small number of hard-core Communists took over a rebel movement that had its origins among liberals and social democrats.

They said President Johnson was correct in preventing a repetition of the Cuban takeover by intervening quickly and massively in the Dominican Republic.

The wisdom of the President's policy, they added, lies in the fact that a coalition government free of Communist influence now exists in Santo Domingo.

During the fiery exchange between Long, who is Democratic whip, and Fulbright, the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Dirksen (R., Ill.), the Republican leader, strode in the chamber.

SEP 16 1965